arXiv:1703.06831v1 [math-ph] 20 Mar 2017

The Bisognano-Wichmann property on nets of standard subspaces, some sufficient conditions

Vincenzo Morinelli *
Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma Tor Vergata,
Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 1, I-00133 Roma, Italy
E-mail: morinell@mat.uniroma2.it

Abstract

We discuss the Bisognano-Wichmann property for local Poincaré covariant nets of standard subspaces. We give a sufficient algebraic condition on the covariant representation ensuring the Bisognano-Wichmann and Duality properties without further assumptions on the net called *"modularity"* condition. It holds for direct integrals of scalar massive and massless representations. We present a class of massive modular covariant nets not satisfying the Bisognano-Wichmann property. Furthermore, we give an outlook in the standard subspace setting on the relation between the Bisognano-Wichmann property and the Split property.

1 Introduction

The Algebraic Quantum Field Theory (AQFT) is a very fruitful approach to study properties of quantum fields using operator algebras. Models of local quantum field theories are described by nets of von Neumann algebras on a fixed spacetime, satisfying basic relativistic and quantum assumptions. A local Poincaré covariant net of von Neumann algebras on a fixed Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a map $\mathbb{R}^{1+3} \supset \mathcal{O} \mapsto \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ from certain open, connected bounded regions of the $1+3$ dimensional Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{1+3}$ to von Neuman algebras $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with U a unitary positive energy Poincaré representation on $\mathcal{H}$ acting covariantly on $\mathcal{A}$ and Ω the unique (up to a phase) normalized U-invariant vector in $\mathcal{H}$, namely the vacuum vector (Ω is assumed to be cyclic for all the local algebras). It is a very fascinating fact the deep connection between the two main characters of the model: the algebraic structure and its geometry. In [2, 3] Bisognano and Wichmann showed that in models coming from Wightman fields the information about the geometry of the net is already contained in it. They proved that the modular operators related to algebras associated to wedge regions and the vacuum state have a geometrical meaning: they implement pure Lorentz transformations. This is expressed through the **Bisognano and Wichmann property (B-W)**:

$$U(\Lambda_W(2\pi t)) = \Delta^{-it}_{\mathcal{A}(W),\Omega}, \qquad \text{for any wedge shaped region } W, \tag{1}$$

*Supported by the ERC advanced grant 669240 QUEST "Quantum Algebraic Structures and Models", and INdAM

where $t \mapsto \Lambda_W(t)$ is the one-parameter group of boosts associated to the wedge W and $\Delta^{it}_{\mathcal{A}(W),\Omega}$ is the modular group associated to $\mathcal{A}(W)$ which is defined as the von Neumann algebra generated by $\cup_{\mathcal{O}\subset W}\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})$ w.r.t. the vacuum vector Ω.

Actually it can be stated something more. Due to the Borchers' Theorem, the whole Poincaré group is encoded in the modular structure of the net algebras. This signed one of the successes of the Tomita-Takesaki theory: once the algebra of observables and the vacuum state is specified, the modular structure is determined and has a geometrical meaning. More in general, when the modular theory of the net implements a covariant unitary representation of the Poincaré group, we shall say that the net is **modular covariant**. Sufficient conditions on this property are in [5, 6, 7, 26].

The Bisognano-Wichmann property cares only about the modular theory of the algebraic model which is contained in the real structure of the net. This can be described by using real "standard" subspaces of the Hilbert state space (cf. definition in Sect. 2). They are completely characterized by their Tomita-Takesaki modular theory (e.g. see [18, 19]), which coincides with the a von Neumann algebra Tomita-Takesaki theory when one consider a von Neumann algebra $A \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with a cyclic and separating vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ and the subspace $H = \overline{A_{sa}\Omega} \subset \mathcal{H}$.

At this point it is natural to consider analogous nets of standard subspaces. It gives a very fruitful approach to QFT. For instance, they have a keyrole in finding localization properties of Infinite Spin particles, cf. Ref. [20] or finding new models in low dimensional quantum field theory [16, 21].

The B-W property is essential to give a canonical structure to first quantization nets, hence to free fields (cf. [4]): given a particle, namely an irreducible unitary positive energy representation of the Poincaré group, there is a canonical way to build up the associated one particle net of localized states and its second quantization free field. We make an analysis in the converse sense. Are those nets in some sense unique? At this level, the question is not well posed since there is some freeness in choosing the modular conjugation implementing the position and time reflection. We can ask when a (unitary, postive energy) Poincaré representation U is **modular, i.e. any net of standard subspaces it acts covariantly on satisfies the B-W property**. In particular U would be implemented by modular operators. This would give an answer to the necessity to assume the B-W property instead of deducing it by the assumptions. It is expected, at least, for irreducible Poincaré, positive energy representations.

We are going to introduce a purely algebraic argument ensuring modularity on direct integral of scalar representations. Exploiting the geometrical symmetry of a wedge-shaped region, we get interested in when the von Neumann algebra generated by translations and the Lorentz subgroup of transformations fixing W, is large enough to enclose the transformations sending W onto its causal complement W'. This is sufficient to show that the quotient between the two sides of (1) is the identity. The condition we state does neither depend on the net nor on multiplicity of the representation and passes to some direct integrals. Our analysis holds for scalar Poincaré representations in any spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{1+s}$, with $s \geq 3$. We rely on the idea that modular covariance, has to be a natural assumption in all QFT's satisfying basic relativistic and quantum hypotheses. We believe that something analogous may be found for spinorial representations.

In general counterexamples to modular covariance may be very artificial and they could imply a breakdown of Poincaré covariance [27]. In Section 5, we give an explicit example

of massive, modular covariant Poincaré net, not respecting Bisognano-Wichmann property (the massless case was already treated in [20]). These general counterexamples make clear what kind of settings may prevent the identification of the covariant representation with the modular symmetries.

The relation between the split and modular covariance properties is an interesting problem. In [11] Doplicher and Longo proved if the dual net of local von Neumann algebras associated to the scalar generalized free field with Källen-Lehmann measure μ has the split property, then μ is purely atomic and concentrated on isolated points. In Section 6 we give an outlook in the standard subspace setting of the above problem and of this result.

This paper was reviewed in [23].

2 One particle net

Standard subspaces

Firstly, we recall some definitions and basic results on standard subspaces and (generalized) one-particle models. A linear, real, closed subspace H of a complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is called **cyclic** if $H + iH$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$, **separating** if $H \cap iH = \{0\}$ and **standard** if it is cyclic and separating.

Given a standard subspace H the associated **Tomita operator** S_H is defined to be the closure of the anti-linear involution:

$$H + iH \ni \xi + i\eta \mapsto \xi - i\eta \in H + iH, \qquad \xi, \eta \in H,$$

on the dense domain $H + iH \subset \mathcal{H}$. The polar decomposition

$$S_H = J_H \Delta_H^{1/2}$$

defines the positive selfadjoint **modular operator** Δ_H and the anti-unitary **modular conjugation** J_H. In particular, Δ_H is invertible and

$$J_H \Delta_H J_H = \Delta_H^{-1}.$$

If H is a real linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, the *symplectic complement* of H is defined by

$$H' \equiv \{\xi \in \mathcal{H} \ ; \ \Im(\xi, \eta) = 0, \forall \eta \in H\} = (iH)^{\perp_{\mathbb{R}}} \ ,$$

where $\perp_{\mathbb{R}}$ denotes the orthogonal in $\mathcal{H}$ viewed as a real Hilbert space with respect to the real part of the scalar product on $\mathcal{H}$. H' is a closed, real linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. If H is standard, then $H = H''$. It is a fact that H is cyclic (resp. separating) iff H' is separating (resp. cyclic), thus H is standard iff H' is standard and we have

$$S_{H'} = S_H^* \ .$$

Fundamental properties of the modular operator and conjugation are

$$\Delta_H^{it} H = H, \quad J_H H = H' \ , \qquad t \in \mathbb{R} \ .$$

We shall call the one-parameter, strongly continuous group $t \mapsto \Delta_H^{it}$, the **modular group** of H (cf. [24]).

There is a 1-1 correspondence between Tomita operators and standard subspaces.

Proposition 2.1. [18, 19]. *The map*

$$H \longmapsto S_H \tag{2}$$

is a bijection between the set of standard subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ and the set of closed, densely defined, anti-linear involutions on $\mathcal{H}$. The inverse of the map (2) *is*

$$S \longmapsto \ker(\mathbf{1} - S).$$

Furthermore, this map is order-preserving, namely

$$H_1 \subset H_2 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad S_{H_1} \subset S_{H_2},$$

and we have $S_H^* = S_{H'}$.

As a consequence,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Standard} \\ \text{subspaces} \\ H \subset \mathcal{H} \end{array} \right\} \overset{1:1}{\longleftrightarrow} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{closed, dens. def.} \\ \text{anti-linear} \\ \text{involution S} \end{array} \right\} \overset{1:1}{\longleftrightarrow} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} (J, \Delta) \text{ anti-unitary} \\ \text{invoution} \\ \text{and self-adjoint} \\ \text{operators on} \, \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t.} \\ J\Delta J = \Delta^{-1} \end{array} \right\}$$

Here is a basic result on standard subspace modular theory.

Lemma 2.2. [18, 19]. *Let $H, K \subset \mathcal{H}$ be standard subspaces and $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ be a unitary operator on $\mathcal{H}$ such that $UH = K$. Then $U\Delta_H U^* = \Delta_K$ and $UJ_H U^* = J_K$.*

The following is the analogue of Takesaki theorem for standard subspaces

Lemma 2.3. [18, 19]. *Let $H \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a standard subspace, and $K \subset H$ be a closed, real linear subspace of H.*

If $\Delta_H^{it} K = K$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$, then K is a standard subspace of $\mathcal{K} \equiv \overline{K + iK}$ and $\Delta_H|_K$ is the modular operator of K on $\mathcal{K}$. Moreover, if K is a cyclic subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, then $H = K$.

The following is the Borchers' theorem in the standard subspace setting.

Theorem 2.4. [18, 19]. *Let $H \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a standard subspace, and $U(t) = e^{itP}$ be a one-parameter unitary group on $\mathcal{H}$ with generator $\pm P > 0$, such that $U(t)H \subset H$, $\forall t \geq 0$. Then,*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Delta_H^{is} U(t) \Delta_H^{-is} = U(e^{\mp 2\pi s} t) \\ JU(t)J = U(-t) \end{array} \right. \qquad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3}$$

Note that that if there is a one-parameter unitary group $t \mapsto U(t)$ with positive generator which properly translates a standard subspace $U(t)H \subset H$, then (3) establish the unique (up to multiplicity), positive energy representation of the translation-dilation group.

The converse of the Borchers' theorem can be stated in the following way

Theorem 2.5. [18, 19]. *Let H be a standard space in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and $U(t) = e^{itP}$ a one-parameter group of unitaries on $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying:*

$$\Delta_H^{is} U(t) \Delta_H^{-is} = U(e^{\mp 2\pi s} t) \quad \textit{and} \quad J_H U(t) J_H = U(-t), \qquad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}$$

The following are equivalent:

1. *$U(t)H \subset H$ for $t \geq 0$;*
2. *$\pm P$ is positive.*

The Minkowski space and the Poincaré group

Let $\mathbb{R}^{1+3}$ be the Minkowski space, i.e. a 4-dimensional real manifold endowed with the metric

$$(x, y) = x_0 y_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{3} x_i y_i.$$

In a 4-vector $x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3)$ x_0 and $\{x_i\}_{i=1,2,3}$ are the time and space coordinates, respectively. The Minkowski space has a causal structure induced by the metric. The causal complement of a region O is given by $O' = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1} : (x-y)^2 < 0, \forall y \in O\}$, where $(x-y)^2 = (x-y, x-y)$ refers to the norm induced by the metric. A **causally closed** region is such that $O = O''$.

We shall denote with $\mathcal{P}$ the **Poincaré group**, i.e the inhomogeneous symmetry group of the Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{3+1}$. It is the semidirect product of the Lorentz group $\mathcal{L}$, the homogeneous Minkowski symmetry group, and the $\mathbb{R}^4$-translation group , i.e. $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}^4 \rtimes \mathcal{L}$. It has four connected components, as $\mathcal{L}$ has four connected components, and we shall indicate with $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow = \mathbb{R}^4 \rtimes \mathcal{L}_+^\uparrow$ the connected component of the identity. One usually refers to $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ as the **proper ortochronous** (connected component of the) **Poincaré group**. $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ is not simply connected and its universal covering $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^4 \rtimes \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Let $\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^4 \rtimes \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \ni (a, A) \longmapsto \Lambda(a, A) \in \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ be the covering map.

Unitary representations of the (universal covering of the) Poincaré group belong to three families massive, massless finite helicity and massless infinite spin. Massive representations are labelled by a mass parameter $m \in (0, +\infty)$ and a spin parameter $s \in \frac{\mathbb{N}}{2}$; massless finite helicity and infinite spin representations have zero mass and are respectively labelled by an helicity parameter $h \in \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{2}$ and a couple (κ, ϵ) where $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the radius and $\epsilon \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ the bose/fermi alternative, respectively.

We shall indicate with $\mathcal{P}_+$ the subgroup of $\mathcal{P}$ generated by $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ and the space and time reflection θ. Consider the automorphism α of the Poincaré group θ generated by the adjoint action of the θ-reflection. The **proper Poincaré group** $\mathcal{P}_+$ is generated as a semi-direct product

$$\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow \rtimes_\alpha \mathbb{Z}_2$$

through α action. It is well known that any irreducible representation of the Poincaré group U, except for finite helicity, extends to an (anti-)unitary representation of $\widetilde{U}$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$, i.e.

$$\widetilde{U}(g) \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{is unitary} & g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow \\ \text{is anti-unitary} & g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\downarrow = \theta \cdot \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow \end{cases}$$

At this point it is necessary to fix some notations about regions and isometries of the Minkowski spacetime. A **wedge shaped region** $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{3+1}$ is an open region of the form gW_1 where $g \in \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ and $W_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1} : |x_0| < x_1\}$. We shall call $W_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}$ wedges along axes, i.e. $W_\alpha = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1} : |x_0| < x_\alpha\}$ with $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$. The set of wedges is denoted by $\mathcal{W}$. Note that if $W \in \mathcal{W}$, then $W' \in \mathcal{W}$. For every wedge region $W \in \mathcal{W}$ there exists a unique one-parameter group of Poincaré boosts $t \mapsto \Lambda_W$ preserving W, i.e. $\Lambda_W(t)W = W$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathcal{W}_0$ be the subset of wedges of the form gW_1 where $g \in \mathcal{L}_+^\uparrow$. Let Λ_α and R_α be the boosts and rotations of $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ fixing W_α. We denote $\lambda_j(t) = e^{\sigma_j t/2}, r_i(\theta) = e^{i\sigma_j \theta/2} \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ the unique continuous one-parameter subgroups in $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ implementing respectively $\Lambda_j(t)$ boosts and $R_j(\theta)$ rotations through Λ, where $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1,2,3}$ are the Pauli matrices.

One-particle nets

Let U be a unitary representation of the Poincaré group $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$ on an Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We shall call a U-covariant net of standard subspaces on wedges a map

$$H : \mathcal{W} \ni W \longmapsto H(W) \subset \mathcal{H},$$

associating to every wedge in $\mathbb{R}^{1+3}$ a closed real linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, satisfying the following properties:

1. **Isotony:** If $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{W}$ and $W_1 \subset W_2$ then $H(W_1) \subset H(W_2)$;
2. **Poincaré Covariance:** $U(g)H(W) = H(gW)$, $\forall g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$, $\forall W \in \mathcal{W}$;
3. **Positivity of the energy:** the joint spectrum of translations in U is contained in the forward light-cone $V_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1} : x^2 = (x,x) \geq 0\}$
4. **Reeh-Schlieder Property:** if $W \in \mathcal{W}$, then $H(W)$ is a cyclic subspace of $\mathcal{H}$;
5. **Twisted Locality:** There exists a self-adjoint unitary operator $\Gamma \in U(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow)'$, s.t. $\Gamma H(W) = H(W)$ for any $W \in \mathcal{W}$ and $W_1 \subset W_2'$ then

   $$BH(W_1) \subset H(W_2)',$$

   with $B = \dfrac{1 + i\Gamma}{1 + i}$.

This is the setting we are going to study the following two properties:

6. **Bisognano-Wichmann Property**: if $W \in \mathcal{W}$, then $U(\Lambda_W(2\pi t)) = \Delta_{H(W)}^{-it}$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$;
7. **Duality property**: if $W \in \mathcal{W}$, then $H(W)' = BH(W')$.

The relations between modular operators of wedge subspaces and the twisted operator are expressed in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.6. *The following equalities hold*

$$[\Delta_{H(W)}, B] = 0$$

$$J_{H(W)} B J_{H(W)} = B^*$$

Proof. As $\Gamma H(W) = H(W)$ then, by Lemma 2.2, $\Gamma \Delta_{H(W)} \Gamma^* = \Delta_{H(W)}$ and $\Gamma J_{H(W)} \Gamma^* = J_{H(W)}$. We conclude after a straightforward computation. □

Proposition 2.7. *Wedge duality is consequence of Bisognano-Wichmann property.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.6 $\Delta_{H(W)} = \Delta_{BH(W)}$ and by covariance

$$U(\Lambda_W(-2\pi t))H(W') = \Delta_{H(W)}^{it} H(W') = H(W').$$

By twisted locality $BH(W') \subset H(W)'$ and Lemma 2.3 we get the thesis. □

It is possible to define closed real linear subspaces associated to bounded causally closed regions as follows

$$H(O) \doteq \bigcap_{\mathcal{W} \ni W \supset O} H(W). \tag{4}$$

This defines a net of real subspaces on causally closed regions $O \mapsto H(O)$. Note that $H(O)$ is not necessarily cyclic. If H is a net satisfying 1.-7. assumptions and $H(O)$ is cyclic, then

$$H(W) = \overline{\sum_{O \subset W} H(O)}$$

by Lemma 2.3. If $H(O)$ is cyclic for any doublecone O, we say that the net $O \mapsto H(O)$ satisfies **Reeh-Schlieder property for doublecones**.

We shall indicate with (U, H) **a Poincaré covariant net of standard subspaces** satisfying 1-5. Assuming B-W property, Brunetti, Guido and Longo, in [4] showed that that there is a 1-1 correspondence between representations of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+$ and nets of standard subspaces. For sake of completeness, we recall their theorem and we present the proof in the fermionic case which is not contained in the original paper.

Theorem 2.8. [4]. *There is a 1-1 correspondence between:*

a. (Anti-)unitary positive energy representation of $\mathcal{P}_+$.

b. Local nets of standard subspaces satisfying 1-7.

Proof. Let $t \mapsto \Lambda_W(t)$ be the Poincaré one-parameter boosts associated to the wedge W. There is just one pre image $\lambda_W(t)$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^{\uparrow}$ of $\Lambda_W(t)$, which is a continuous one-parameter group. Consider the automorphism of the Poincaré group $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+$ generated by the adjoint action of j_3, one of the two $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+$ element implementing the $x_0 - x_3$ reflection. One can check in $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+$ that

$$(a, A) j_3 = (j_3 a, \sigma_1 A \sigma_1), \qquad \forall (a, A) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \rtimes \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \tag{5}$$

and

$$(\pi)\lambda_3(t) r_1(\pi)^{-1} = \lambda_3(-t) \qquad \text{and} \qquad r_1(\pi) j_3 r_1(\pi)^{-1} = -j_3, \tag{6}$$

(e.g. cf. Appendix in [22]). Consider an (irreducible) fermionic representation U of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+$, namely a $\mathcal{P}_+$-representation which does not factor on $\mathcal{P}_+$. In particular $U(2\pi) = -\mathbf{1}$. As U lifts to a representation of the Lie algebra of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^{\uparrow}$ on the Gärding domain and by relation (5) and (6) we get

$$U(R_1(\pi)) K_3 U(R_1(\pi))^* = K_3^{-1}, \tag{7}$$

$$U(R_1(\pi)) J_3 U(R_1(\pi))^* = -J_3, \tag{8}$$

where $U(\Lambda_3(t)) = e^{iK_3 t}$ and J_3 implements $U(j_3)$ (choose one of the two possible choice for $U(j_3)$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+$). The anti-unitary operator $J_3 = U(j_3)$ and the self-adjoint operator $\Delta_{W_3} = e^{2\pi K_3}$ satisfy $J_3 \Delta_{W_3} J_3 = \Delta_{W_3}^{-1}$. Hence, it is possible to define an anti-unitary involution $S_{W_3} = J_3 \Delta_{W_3}^{1/2}$, and, by Proposition 2.1, a subspace $H(W_3)$ associated to the W_3 wedge. Clearly S_{W_3} is the Tomita operator $S_{H(W_3)}$ of the subspace $H(W_3)$. By covariance, a map of standard subspaces $\mathcal{W} \ni W \longmapsto H(W) \subset \mathcal{H}$ is well defined. Indeed, for any wedge W, $S_{H(W)}$ is the Tomita operator determining $H(W)$, defined as $S_{H(W)} = U(g) S_{H(W_3)} U(g)^*$,

with $g \in \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ such that $gW_3 = W$. Notice that $S_{H(W)} = S_{H(r(2\pi)W)}$ and $S_{H(W)}$ is well defined. This clarify the ambiguity in the choice of J_3. Furthermore, by the above analysis, when $S_{H(W)} = J_W \Delta_W^{1/2}$ then $S_{H(W')} = -J_W \Delta_{H(W)}^{-1/2}$. It easily follows that $H(W') = iH(W)'$. This ensures twisted-locality as we can define $\Gamma \doteq U(2\pi) \in U(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow)'$ and $B = \frac{1+i}{1-i} \cdot \mathbf{1} = -i \cdot \mathbf{1}$ is a twisted operator, i.e. $H(W') = BH(W)'$ where $W \in \mathcal{W}$. Positivity of the energy, Poincaré covariance, Bisognano-Wichmann and Reeh-Schlieder properties are ensured by construction. Duality follows by Proposition 2.7. Isotony follows as in [4] by positivity of the energy and Theorem 2.5. □

In view of Theorem 2.8, our question is: *which families of representations preserve the 1-1 correspondence when the Bisognano-Wichmann and Duality properties are not assumed?*

3 A modularity condition for the Bisognano-Wichmann Property

We shall call G_W^0 the set $\{g \in \mathcal{L}_+^\uparrow : gW = W\}$ associated to a wedge $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$. G_W denotes the Poincaré subgroup generated by G_W^0 and the full translation group. By transitivity of the $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ action on wedges, G_W^0 and G_W can be defined for any $W \in \mathcal{W}$.

Let $W \in \mathcal{W}$, the strongly continuous map

$$Z_{H(W)} : \mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto \Delta_{H(W)}^{it} U(\Lambda_W(2\pi t)) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}),$$

is the proper quotient between the modular group of $H(W)$ and the unitary implementation of the one-parameter boost transformations associated to W. Indeed, it has to be identity map if the B-W property holds.

Proposition 3.1. *Let (U, H) be a Poincaré covariant net of standard subspaces. Then, for every $W \in \mathcal{W}$, $t \mapsto Z_{H(W)}(t)$ defines a one-parameter group and*

$$Z_{H(W)}(t) \in U(G_W)', \qquad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. There is no loss of generality if we fix $W = W_3$ and consider $G_W = G_3 \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$. As $\Lambda_3(t)W_3 = W_3$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ then $U(\Lambda_3(t))H(W_3) = H(W_3)$ and, by Lemma 2.2, $\Delta_{H(W_3)}$ commutes with $U(\Lambda_3)$. In particular $Z_{H(W_3)}$ defines a one-parameter group.

By positivity of the energy and Borchers' Theorem 2.4, $\Delta_{H(W_3)}^{-it}$ has the same commutation relations as boosts $U(\Lambda_3(2\pi t))$ w.r.t. translations. Indeed, $\Delta_{H(W_3)}^{it}$ commutes with translations in x_1 and x_2 directions (they fix $H(W_3)$) as well as $U(\Lambda_3(t))$. Translations along directions $\mathrm{v}_+ = (1, 0, 0, 1)$ and $\mathrm{v}_- = (-1, 0, 0, 1)$ have respectively positive and negative generators and $U(t)H(W_3) \subset H(W_3)$ for any $t > 0$. Then, by Theorem 2.4

$$\Delta_{H(W_3)}^{is} U_\pm(t) \Delta_{H(W_3)}^{-is} = U_\pm(e^{\mp 2\pi s} t) \qquad s, t \in \mathbb{R},$$

as well as

$$U(\Lambda_{W_3}(-2\pi t)) U_\pm(t) U(\Lambda_{W_3}(2\pi t)) = U_\pm(e^{\mp 2\pi s} t), \qquad s, t \in \mathbb{R}$$

where $U_\pm(t) = U(t \cdot \mathrm{v}_\pm)$. Translations along x_1, x_2, v_+ and v_- generate $\mathbb{R}^4$ translations and as a consequence $Z_{H(W_3)} \in U(\mathcal{T})'$.

Now, the one-parameter subgroups $U(R_3(\theta))$ and $U(\Lambda_3(t))$ fix the standard subspace $H(W_3)$, hence, by Lemma 2.2, they commute with the modular operator $\Delta_{H(W_3)}$, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. It follows $Z_{H(W_3)}(t)$ commutes with $U(G_3)$, hence $Z_{H(W_3)}(t) \in U(G_3)'$. □

Now, we state our algebraic condition.

Definition 3.2. Let U be a (unitary, postive energy) $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$-representation, the U satisfies the **modularity condition** if $r_W \in \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$, such that $r_W W = W'$, then

$$U(r_W) \in U(G_W)''. \tag{Mod}$$

Theorem 3.3. *Let (U, H) be a Poincaré covariant net of standard subspaces. Let $W \in \mathcal{W}$, and $r_W \in \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ be such that $r_W W = W'$. If $Z_{H(W)}$ commutes with $U(r_W)$, then the Bisognano-Wichmann and Duality properties hold.*

Proof. The map

$$\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto Z_{H(W)}(t)$$

is a unitary, one-parameter, s.o.-continuous group by Proposition 3.1. Now by hypotheses and covariance

$$Z_{H(W')}(t) = U(\Lambda(r_W)) Z_{H(W)}(t) U(\Lambda(r_W))^* = Z_{H(W)}(t)$$

where

$$Z_{H(W')}(t) = U(\Lambda_W(-2\pi t)) \Delta_{H(W')}^{it}.$$

We find that

$$Z_{H(W)}(2t) = Z_{H(W)}(t) Z_{H(W)}(t) = Z_{H(W)}(t) Z_{H(W')}(t) = \Delta_{H(W)}^{it} \Delta_{H(W')}^{it}$$

and since $Z_{H(W)}(2t)$ is an automorphism of $H(W)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{H(W)}^{-it} Z_{H(W)}(2t) H(W) = \Delta_{H(W')}^{it} H(W) \Leftrightarrow \\ \Delta_{H(W)}^{-it} H(W) = \Delta_{H(W')}^{it} H(W) \Leftrightarrow \\ H(W) = \Delta_{H(W')}^{it} H(W) \qquad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

By locality $H(W) \subset (B\, H(W'))'$, lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.6, we have

$$\Delta_{(BH(W'))'}^{it} H(W) = \Delta_{BH(W')}^{-it} H(W) = \Delta_{H(W')}^{-it} H(W) = H(W)$$

and by Lemma 2.3 we conclude wedge duality,

$$H(W) = (B\, H(W'))'.$$

Furthermore, by the last condition for any $W \in \mathcal{W}$ then

$$\Delta_{H(W)} = \Delta_{H(W')}^{-1}$$

and the Bisognano-Wichmann property follows since

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{H(W)}(t) &= U(\Lambda(r_W))Z_{H(W)}(t)U(\Lambda(r_W))^* \\ &= U(\Lambda(-2\pi t))\Delta_{H(W)}^{-it} = Z_{H(W}(-t) \end{aligned}$$

and $Z_{H(W)}(t) = \mathbf{1}$. □

Let U be a representation of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$ acting on a standard subspace net $\mathcal{W} \ni W \mapsto H(W) \subset \mathcal{H}$. Assume that $J_{geo,W}$ is an anti-unitary operator extending U to a representation of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}_+}$ through W-reflection and assume that modular covariance holds. As in [15], the algebraic $J_{H(W)}$ implements the wedge W reflection and, up to a $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$ element, the PCT operator (the proof in [15] can be straight forwardly adapted in the standard subspace net case). In this setting, let K_W be the W-boosts generator on $\mathcal{H}$, the following operators

$$S_{geo,W} \doteq J_{geo,W} e^{-\pi K_W}, \qquad S_{Tom,W} \doteq J_{H(W)} \Delta_{H(W)}^{1/2}, \tag{9}$$

can be called **geometric** and **algebraic Tomita operators**.

Corollary 3.4. *With the assumption of Theorem 3.3,*

$$S_{geo_W} = C S_{tom_W}, \qquad \forall W \in \mathcal{W}$$

where $C \in U(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow)'$

Proof. By duality, $J_{geo,W}$ and $J_{H(W)}$ both implements anti-unitarily $U(j_W)$, then $J_{geo} J_{H(W)} \in U(\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow)'$. By Bisognano-Wichmann property, $e^{-\pi K_W} = \Delta_W^{1/2}$, and we conclude. □

The Bisognano-Wichmann property and $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+$ covariance do not imply that there is a unique net undergoing the U action. The conjugation operator can differ from the geometric conjugation by a unitary in $U(\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow)'$. For instance, for an irreducible, (anti-)unitary representation, we have just two covariant nets, according to the couples $(U(j_W), e^{-2\pi K_W})$ and $(-U(j_W), e^{2\pi K_W})$ defining the wedge subspaces.

It is a corollary that representations satisfying (Mod) are modular.

Corollary 3.5. *With the assumptions of Theorem 3.3, if condition* (Mod) *holds on* U*, then Bisognano-Wichmann and Duality properties hold on* H*.*

Direct sums

The modularity property easily extends to direct integrals and multiples of representations as the following proposition shows.

Proposition 3.6. *Let* U *and* $\{U_x\}_{x\in X}$ *be unitary positive energy representations of* $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$ *satisfying* (Mod)*.*

Let $\mathcal{K}$ *be an Hilbert space, then* (Mod) *holds for* $U \otimes 1_{\mathcal{K}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$*.*

Let (X, μ) *be a standard measure space. Assume that* $U_x|_{G_W}$ *and* $U_y|_{G_W}$ *are disjoint for* μ*-a.e.* $x \neq y$ *in* X*. Then* $U = \int_X U_x d\mu(x)$ *satisfies* (Mod)*.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U} \doteq U \otimes 1_K$, since $\mathcal{U}(G_3)' = U(G_3)' \otimes B(\mathcal{K})$ it follows that $\mathcal{U}(R_1(\pi)) = U(R_1(\pi)) \otimes 1$ commutes with $\mathcal{U}(G_3)'$, hence $\mathcal{U}(R_1(\pi)) \in \mathcal{U}(G_3)''$.

For the second statement, let

$$U(a,\Lambda) = \int_X^{\oplus} U_x(a,\Lambda) d\mu(x) \quad \text{acting on} \quad \mathcal{H} = \int_X^{\oplus} \mathcal{H}_x d\mu(x).$$

Then, by disjointness,

$$U(G_3)'' = \int_X^{\oplus} U_x(G_3)'' d\mu(x)$$

and $U(R_1) = \int_X^{\oplus} U(R_1(\pi)) d\mu(x)$ and $U(R_1(\pi)) \in U(G_3)''$ □

4 The scalar case

As we have announced, the above analysis holds for scalar representations, namely a massive or massless 0-spin/helicity representation. They have the following form

$$(U_{m,0}(a,A)\phi)(p) = e^{iap}\phi(\Lambda(A)^{-1}p),$$

where

$$\phi \in \mathcal{H}_{m,0} \doteq L^2(\Omega_m, \delta(p^2 - m^2)\theta(p_0)d^4p),$$

and $\Omega_m = \{p = (p_0, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+3} : p^2 = p_0^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 = m^2\}$.

We start this section with the following remark.

Remark 4.1. Fix $p = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \Omega_m$, $m > 0$,

$$R_1(\pi)p = (p_0, p_1, -p_2, -p_3)$$

can be obtained as a composition of a Λ_3-boost of parameter t_p and a R_3-rotation of parameter θ_p as

$$\Lambda_3(t_p)R_3(\theta_p)(p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) = \Lambda_3(t_p)(p_0, p_1, -p_2, p_3) = (p_0, p_1, -p_2, -p_3). \tag{10}$$

Clearly t_p and θ_p depend on p. By (10), we deduce that G_3 orbits on Ω_m are not changed by $R_1(\pi)$. With $m = 0$ an analogue argument holds for all the orbits except $\{(p_0, 0, 0, p_0), p_0 \geq 0\}$ and $\{(p_0, 0, 0, -p_0), p_0 \geq 0\}$, i.e. there is no $g \in G_3$, such that $g(p_0, 0, 0, -p_0) = (p_0, 0, 0, p_0)$. On the other hand these orbits have null measure with the restriction of the Lebesgue measure to ∂V_+. This remark holds in $\mathbb{R}^{s+1}$ where $s > 2$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f \in L^\infty(\Omega_m)$ such that for every $g \in G_3^0$, $f(p) = f(gp)$ for a.e. $p \in \Omega_m$. Then $f(p) = h(p)$ for a.e. $p \in \Omega_m$ where $h \in L^\infty(\Omega_m)$ is constant on ant $\overline{\{g^{-1}p\}}_{g \in G_3}$ orbit.*

Proof. Any $p = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \Omega_m$ can be identified with a radius $r = p_1^2 + p_2^2$, an angle $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, $(p_1, p_2) = r(\cos\theta, \sin\theta)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that if $(p_0, p_3) = \sqrt{r^2 + m^2}(\cosh t, \sinh t)$. In particular G_3^0 orbits σ_r are labelled by $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$. On each orbit (with its invariant G_3^0

measure), the ergodic action of G_3^0 ensures that G_3^0 constant function has to be almost everywhere constant. Up to unitary equivalence, we can decompose the Hilbert space as $\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} L^2(\sigma_r, d\mu_r)dr$ where $d\mu_r$ is the G_3 invariant measure on σ_r. As G_3 representations on different orbits are inequivalent, thus $U(G_3)' = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+}(f(r)\cdot 1)dr$ and we conclude. □

Proposition 4.3. *Let U be a unitary irreducible scalar representation of the Poicaré group. Then U satisfies the modularity condition* (Mod)*.*

Proof. Let $Z \in U(G_3)'$. Since U is a scalar representation then the translation algebra $\mathcal{T} = \{U(a) : a \in \mathbb{R}^4\}''$ is a MASA and $\mathcal{T} = L^\infty(\Omega_m)$. In particular Z would be in $Z \in \mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T}$, hence is a multiplication operator $Z = M_f$, $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Furthermore Z has to commute with $U(\Lambda_3)$ and $U(R_3)$, hence $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$

$$U(\Lambda_3(t))ZU(\Lambda_3(t))^* = Z \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f(\Lambda_3(t)^{-1}p) = f(p), \qquad \text{a.e. } p \in \Omega_m$$

and for any

$$U(R_3(\theta))ZU(R_3(\theta))^* = Z \quad \Leftrightarrow f(R_3(\theta)^{-1}p) = f(p) \qquad \text{a.e. } p \in \Omega_m.$$

We can assume $f(p)$ be constant on any Λ_3 and R_3 orbits by Lemma 4.2.

Now observe that any momentum on the hyperboloid $p = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3)$ can be connected to the $R_1(\pi)p = (p_0, p_1, -p_2, -p_3)$ through a R_3-rotations and a Λ_3-boosts as in Remark 4.1. It follows that $f(p) = f(R_1(-\pi)p)$, for every $p \in \Omega_m$. As a consequence

$$U(R_1(\pi))ZU(R_1(\pi))^* = Z \quad \Leftrightarrow f(R_1(\pi)^{-1}p) = f(p), \qquad \forall p \in \Omega_m$$

and we conclude. □

Now, we can state the theorem.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $U = \int_{[0,+\infty)} U_m d\mu(m)$ where $\{U_m\}$ are (finite or infinite) multiples of the scalar representation of mass m. Then U satisfies* (Mod)*, hence Duality and Bisognano-Wichmann properties hold.*

Proof. Unitary representations of $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ with different masses are disjoint, hence they have disjoint restrictions to G_3 subgroup. The thesis become a consequence of Propositions 3.6, 4.3 and Corollary 3.5 . □

The above argument holds also for finite helicity representations as the representation of the little group is abelian. As a consequence, an irreducible non zero helicity representation U can not act covariantly on a net of standard subspaces on wedges H. Indeed, Bisognano-Wichmann property must hold as in Proposition 4.3 and J_{W_3}, modular conjugation of $H(W_3)$, would implement the j_3 reflection on U. In particular, the PT operator defined by $\Theta = J_{W_3}U(R_3(\pi))$ extends U to an (anti-)unitary representation $\hat{U}$ of $\mathcal{P}_+$ and acts covariantly on H. Non-zero helicity representations are not induced by a self conjugate representation of the little group and do not extend to a representation of $\mathcal{P}_+$. This shows a contradiction.

In $\mathbb{R}^{s+1}$ spacetime dimensions, with $s \geq 3$, let U be a scalar representation. $Z_{H(W_1)}(t)$ is generated by a real function of the form $f(p_2^2 + ...p_d^2)$ and there is just one orbit of the subgroup fixing W_1 for each radius value of $r = p_2^2 + ... + p_d^2$. This fails in $2+1$ spacetime dimensions as $R_2(\pi)$ change G_1-orbits. This analysis holds in any Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{s+1}$ with $s \geq 3$.

5 Massive counter-examples

Borchers, in [5], showed that a Poincaré representation acting covariantly on a von Neumann algebra net $\mathcal{A}$ in the vacuum sector, can only differ from the modular representation by a unitary representation of the Lorentz group.

Theorem 5.1. [5]. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a local quantum field theory von Neumann algebra net in the vacuum sector undergoing two different representations of the Poincaré group. Let U_0 be the representation implemented by wedge modular operators and U_1 the second representation. Then there exists a unitary representation of the Lorentz Group $G(\Lambda)$ defined*

$$G(\Lambda) = U_1(a, \Lambda)U_0(a, \Lambda)^*.$$

Furthermore, $G(\Lambda)$ commutes with $U_0(a, \Lambda')$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1}$, Λ, $\Lambda' \in \mathcal{L}_+^{\uparrow}$ and the $G(\Lambda)$ adjoint action on $\mathcal{A}$ implements automorphisms of local algebras, i.e. maps any local algebra into itself.

With this hint it is possible to build up Poincaré covariant nets picturing the above situation: *modular covariance without Bisognano-Wichmann property.* We are going to make explicit computations on this kind of counterexamples in order to understand what may prevent Bisognano-Wichmann property. Here, we study the massive case. The massless case can be found in [20].

Consider $U_{m,s}$ m-mass, s-spin, unitary, irreducible representation of the Poincaré group $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^{\uparrow}$ and $H : W \mapsto H(W)$ its canonical net of standard subspaces. Let $p \in \Omega_m$, $A_p \doteq \sqrt{\underset{\sim}{p}/m}$, where $\underset{\sim}{p} = p_0 \cdot 1 + \sum_{i=1}^3 p_i\sigma_i$ is the $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ element implementing the boost sending the point $q_m = (m, 0, 0, 0)$ to p. An explicit form of $U_{m,s}$ is the following

$$(U_{m,s}(a, A)\phi)(p) = e^{iap}\mathcal{D}^s(A_p^{-1}AA_{\Lambda^{-1}p})\phi(\Lambda(A)^{-1}p),$$

where $\mathcal{D}^s$ is the s-spin representation of $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ on the $2s+1$ dimensional Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h}_s$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\phi \in \mathcal{H}_{m,s} &\doteq \mathfrak{h}_s \otimes L^2(\Omega_m, \delta(p^2 - m^2)\theta(p_0)d^4p) \\ &= \mathbb{C}^{2s+1} \otimes L^2(\Omega_m, \delta(p^2 - m^2)\theta(p_0)d^4p).\end{aligned}$$

Let V be a real unitary, non trivial, representation $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ on an Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$, i.e. that there exists an anti-unitary involution J on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$, commuting with V such that the real vector space $K \subset \mathcal{K}$ of J-fixed vectors, is a standard subspace such that

$$V(\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}))K = K.$$

In particular $JK = K$ and $\Delta_K = 1$.

We can define the following new net of standard subspaces,

$$K \otimes H : \mathcal{W} \ni W \to K \otimes H(W) \subset \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}.$$

On this net we can see two Poincaré representations acting covariantly on $K \otimes H$:

$$U_I(a, A) \equiv 1 \otimes U_{m,s}(a, A) \qquad A \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}),\ a \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1}$$

and

$$U_V(a, A) \equiv V(A) \otimes U_{m,s}(a, A) \qquad A \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}),\ a \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1}.$$

U_I is implemented by $K \otimes H$ modular operators and Bisognano-Wichmann property holds w.r.t. U_I (cf. Lemma 2.6 in [20]). Assuming $s = 0$, U_I satisfies condition (Mod), hence BW property also by Corollary 3.5.

We note that U_V decomposes in a direct sum of infinitely many inequivalent representations of mass m, i.e. infinitely many spins appear. Consider the Lorentz transformation $A_p = \sqrt{p/m}$ and the unitary operator on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$

$$W : \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H} \ni (p \mapsto \phi(p)) \longmapsto \big(p \mapsto (V(A_p^{-1}) \otimes 1_{\mathbb{C}^{2s+1}})\phi(p)\big) \in \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H} \tag{11}$$

as $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H} = L^2(\Omega_m, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2s+1}, \delta(p^2 - m^2)\theta(p_0)d^4p)$.

We can define a unitarily equivalent representation $U'_V = WU_VW^*$ as follows

$$(U'_V(a, A)\phi)(p) = e^{ia\cdot p}(V(A_p^{-1}AA_{\Lambda(A)^{-1}p}) \otimes \mathcal{D}^s(A_p^{-1}AA_{\Lambda(A)^{-1}p}))\phi(\Lambda(A^{-1}p)).$$

It's easy to see that $A_p^{-1}AA_{\Lambda(A)^{-1}p} \in \mathrm{Stab}(m, 0, 0, 0) = \mathrm{SU}(2)$

As we are interested in disintegration of U_V it is not restrictive to assume that V is irreducible. Unitary irreducible representations of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ are labelled by pairs of numbers (ρ, n) such that $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. It's a classical result (see e.g. Section 3-5 in [25]) that restriction of an irreducible representation $V_{\rho,n}$ of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ to $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ can be decomposed as $\bigoplus_{s=n/2}^{+\infty} \mathcal{D}^s$. If $V_{\rho,n}$ is an irreducible $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ representation then

$$U_V \simeq \bigoplus_{i=\frac{n}{2}}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{j=|s-i|}^{s+i} U_{m,j}. \tag{12}$$

Note that *any representation class appears with finite multiplicity*. Note that U_V does not satisfy condition (Mod). Furthermore, we can conclude that having modular covariance without the Bisognano-Wichmann property requires to the "wrong" representation the presence of an infinite family of inequivalent Poincaré representations.

U_I does not act covariantly on the U_V-canonical net H_V. Let W_1 be the wedge in x_1 direction and $W = gW_1$ where $g \in \mathcal{L}_+^{\uparrow}$ and $W_1 \neq W$. If $U_I(g)H_V(W_1) = H_V(W)$ then $U_I(g)\Delta_{H_V(W_1)}^{-it}U_I(g)^* = \Delta_{H_V(W)}^{-it}$ where $\Delta_{H_V(W_1)}$ and $\Delta_{H_V(W)}$ are respectively modular operator of $H_V(W_1)$ and $H_V(W)$. As

$$\begin{aligned} U_I(g)\Delta_{H_V(W_1)}^{-it}U_I(g)^* &= \\ &= (1 \otimes U_{m,s}(g))(V(\Lambda_{W_1}(2\pi t) \otimes U_{m,s}(\Lambda_{W_1}(2\pi t)))(1 \otimes U_{m,s}(g))^* \\ &= V(\Lambda_{W_1}(2\pi t)) \otimes U_{m,s}(g\Lambda_{W_1}(2\pi t))g^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

but $\Delta_{H_V(W)}^{-it} = V(g\Lambda_{W_1}(2\pi t)g^{-1}) \otimes U_{m,s}(g\Lambda_{W_1}(2\pi t))g^{-1})$, we get the contradiction unless V is trivial.

In the above setting, $\Theta_{m,s} = J_{W_3}U_{m,s}(R_3(\pi))$ implements the PT symmetry θ,

$$\theta p = -p, \qquad p \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1},$$

on the representation $U_{m,s}$, then $J \otimes \Theta_{m,s}$ implements θ on U_I and acts covariantly on H_I. $J \otimes \Theta_{m,s}$ is not the PT operator for the representation U_V as

$$(J \otimes \Theta_{m,s})(V(A) \otimes U_{m,s}(a, A))(J \otimes \Theta_{m,s}) = V(A) \otimes U_{m,s}(\theta a, \theta A \theta^{-1}).$$

Thus the U_V extension to $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$ does not act covariantly on H_I.

Actually modular covariance and the identification of the geometric and algebraic PCT operators implies the uniqueness of covariant representation.

Corollary 5.2. *With the assumptions of Theorem 5.1 assume that the algebraic PCT operator (cf. (9)) implements the U_1-PCT operator too. Then $U_1 = U_0$.*

Proof. With the notations of Theroem 5.1, we consider the representation $U_1(a, \Lambda) = G(\Lambda)U_0(a, \Lambda)$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow$ on $\mathcal{H}$. G fixes anysubspace $H(W)$ and in particular $J_{H(W)}G(\Lambda)J_{H(W)} = G(\Lambda)$. It follows that $J_{H(W)}$ has the correct commutation relations with U_1 if and only if $G = 1$. □

As we have just seen, on a Poincaré covariant net, we can change the covariant representation, if the commutant $U(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+^\uparrow)'$ is large enough. It is possible at least when the Poincaré representation, implemented by modular operators, has infinite multiplicity. Counterexamples can produce wrong connection with spin and statistics, for instance assuming $U_I(r(2\pi)) = \mathbf{1}$ and $V(r(2\pi)) = -\mathbf{1}$ where $r(2\pi)$ is the 2π-rotation. The (Mod) condition does not hold for U_V and wrong spin statistics relation may arise whenever B-W property fails.

As we said in the introduction counterexamples to modular covariance, as far as we know, are very artificial and not all the basic relativistic and quantum assumptions are respected. It is interesting to look for natural counterexamples to modular covariance, in the class of representations excluded by this discussion, if they exist. In [12] it is shown that whenever there is finite one particle degeneracy Spin-Statistics Theorem holds. This accords with the analysis obtained by Mund in [22]. We expect that an algebraic proof for B-W property can be established, without assuming finite multiplicity of sub-representations.

6 Outlook

Now we come to an outlook on the relation between split and Bisognano-Wichmann properties.

Definition 6.1. Let $(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \Omega)$ be an *standard inclusion* of von Neumann algebras, i.e. Ω is a cyclic and separating vector for N, M and $N' \cap M$.

A standard inclusion $(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \Omega)$ is *split* if there exists a type I factor $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{M}$.

A Poincaré covariant net $(\mathcal{A}, U, \Omega)$ satisfies the *split property* if the von Neumann algebra inclusion $(\mathcal{A}(O_1) \subset \mathcal{A}(O_2), \Omega)$ is split, for every compact inclusion of bounded causally closed regions $O_1 \Subset O_2$.

We are going to give a coherent definition for standard subspaces. In a naive way one can define split property for second quantizations von Neumann algebras as: *let $K \subset H \subset \mathcal{H}$ inclusion of standard subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $K' \cap H$ is standard. The inclusion is split if their second quantization inclusion $R(K) \subset R(H)$ is standard split w.r.t. the vacuum vector $\Omega \in e^{\mathcal{H}}$.* We just deal with Bosonic second quantization (see e.g.[17]).

We want a first quantization version of split property. We assume H and K to be **factor** subspaces, i.e. $H \cap H' = \{0\} = K \cap K'$. We need the following theorem

Theorem 6.2. [13]. *Let H be a standard subspace and $R(H)$ be its second quantization.*

- *Second quantization factors are type I if and only if $\Delta_H|_{[0,1]}$ is a trace class operator where $\Delta_H|_{[0,1]}$ is the restriction of the H-modular operator Δ_H to the spectral subspace relative to the interval $[0, 1]$*
- *Second quantization factor which are not type I are type III.*

The canonical intermediate factor, for a standard split inclusion of von Neumann algebras $N \subset M$ is

$$\mathcal{F} = N \vee JNJ = M \cap JMJ$$

where J is the modular conjugation associated to the relative commutant algebra $(N' \cap M, \Omega)$, cf. [11]. The standard inclusion $(N \subset M, \Omega)$ is split iff $\mathcal{F}$ is type I. A canonical intermediate subspace can be analogously defined for standard split subspace inclusions $K \subset H$:

$$F = \overline{K + JK} = H \cap JH.$$

The second quantization is well posed and $R(F) = \mathcal{F}$. Indeed, second quantization respects the lattice structure, as originally proven in [1]. The modular operators were computed in [10, 17, 14].

Consider the following proposition:

Proposition 6.3. *Let $K \subset H$ be an inclusion of standard subspaces, such that $K' \cap H$ is standard. Let J be the modular conjugation of the relative symplectic complement $K' \cap H$ and $\Delta = \Delta_F$ be the modular operator of the intermediate subspace $F = \overline{K + JK}$. Assume that F is a factor. Then TFAE*

1. *$R(K) \subset R(H)$ is a split inclusion*
2. *the operator $\Delta|_{[0,1]}$ is trace class.*

Proof. (1. $\Rightarrow$ 2.) If the inclusion is split the intermediate canonical factor $R(K) \vee JR(K)J$ is second quantization of $K \vee JK$. In particular by Theorem 6.2 the thesis holds.
(2. $\Rightarrow$ 1.) As $\Delta|_{[0,1]}$ is trace class, then the second quantization of F is an intermediate type I factor between $R(K)$ and $R(H)$ by Theorem 6.2. Split property holds for the inclusion $R(H) \subset R(K)$. □

Let U be an (anti-)unitary representation of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_+$. We shall say that U is **split** if the canonical net associated to U satisfies split property on bounded causally closed regions (defined through equation 4), i.e. the inclusion

$$H(O_1) \subset H(O_2)$$

is split for every $O_1 \Subset O_2$ as above.

A scalar irreducible representation satisfies nuclearity assumptions, hence split (cf.[9, 8]). The following theorem is the first quantization analogue of Theorem 10.2 in [11].

Theorem 6.4. *Let U be an (anti-)unitary representation of $\mathcal{P}_+$, direct integral of scalar representations. If U has split property then $U = \int_0^{+\infty} U_m d\mu(m)$ where μ is purely atomic and for each mass there can only be a finite multiple of $U_{m,0}$.*

Proof. As Bisognano-Wichmann property hold, the net disintegrate according to the representation:

$$H = \int_0^{+\infty} H_m d\mu(m)$$

where H_m is the canonical net associated to U_m.
Fix a couple of bounded and causally closed regions $O_1 \subset O_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{3+1}$. Irreducible components satisfy split property, hence the restriction of the modular operator of the intermediate stadard subspace F, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} F = \overline{H(O_1) + JH(O_1)} &= \int_0^{+\infty} \overline{H_m(O_1) + J_m H_m(O_1)_m} d\mu(m) \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} F_m \, d\mu(m), \end{aligned}$$

to the spectral subset relatively to $[0, 1]$, has to be trace class. It follows that μ has to be purely atomic and for each mass there can only be a finite multiple of the scalar representation. □

Corollary 6.5. *Let (U, H) be a Poincaré covariant net of standard subspaces and U be a $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$-split representation. Assume that U is a direct integral of scalar representations. Then the Bisognano-Wichmann and duality properties hold.*

Proof. By Theorem 6.4 the disintegration of the covariant Poincaré representation is purely atomic on masses, concentrated on isolated points and for each mass there can only be a finite multiple of the scalar representation. The disintegration satisfies condition (Mod) and the thesis follows by Corollary 3.5. □

It remains an old interesting challenge to build up a more general bridge between Split and Bisognano-Wichmann properties. We expect that the above analysis can be generalized whenever finite direct sums of finite multiples of spinorial representations appear on a fixed mass but a further analysis is needed.

Acknowledgements

I hearthful thank Roberto Longo for suggesting me the problem and useful comments and M. Bischoff for discussing proposition 6.3. I alsto thank Sergio Ciamprone and Yoh tanimoto for comments.

References

[1] H. Araki, *A lattice of von Neumann algebras associated with the Quantum Theory of a free Bose field*, J. Math. Phys. **4** (1963), 1343–1362.

[2] J. J. Bisognano, E.H. Wichmann, On the Duality condition for quantum fields, *J. Math. Phys.* **17** (1976), 303–321.

[3] J. J. Bisognano, E. H. Wichmann, On the Duality condition for Hermitian scalar field, *J. Math. Phys.* **16** (1975), 985–1007.

[4] R. Brunetti, D. Guido, R. Longo, Modular localization and Wigner particles, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **14**, N. 7 & 8 (2002), 759–786.

[5] H. J. Borchers, On Poincaré transformations and the modular group of the algebra associated with a wedge, *Lett. Math. Phys.* 46, no. 4, (1998), 295–301

[6] H. J. Borchers, The CPT Theorem in two-dimensional theories of local observables, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **143** (1992), 315–332.

[7] D. Buchholz, O. Dreyer, M. Florig, S. J. Summers, Geometric modular action and spacetime symmetry groups, *Rev. Math. Phys.*, **12**, no. 4, (2000), 475–560.

[8] D. Buchholz, C. D'antoni, R. Longo, *Nuclearity and thermal states in conformal field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **270**, no.1 (2006).

[9] D. Buchholz, E. Wichmann, *Causal independence and the energy-level density of states in local quantum field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **106** (1986), no. 2, 321–344.

[10] J. P. Eckmann, K. Osterwalder, *An application of Tomita's theory of modular Hilbert algebras: duality for free Bose Fields*, J. Funct. Anal. **13** (1973), 1–12.

[11] S. Doplicher, R. Longo, Standard and Split inclusions of von Neumann algebras, *Invent. Math.*, **75**, 3, 493–536, (1984).

[12] S. Doplicher, R. Haag, J. E. Roberts, *Local observables and particle statistics. II*, Comm. Math. Phys. **35** (1974), 49–85.

[13] F. Figliolini and D. Guido, *On the type of second quantization factors*, J. Operator Theory, **31**, 229–252, (1994)

[14] J. J. Foit, *Abstract twisted duality for quantum free Fermi fields*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **19** (1983), 729–74.

[15] D. Guido, R. Longo, An algebraic spin and statistics theorem, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **172**, (1995), 517–533.

[16] G. Lechner, R. Longo, *Localization in nets of standard spaces*, Commun. Math. Phys. **336** (2015), 27–61.

[17] P. Leyland, J. E. Roberts, D. Testard, *Duality for quantum free fields*, unpublished manuscript, Marseille 1978.

[18] R. Longo, "Lectures on Conformal Nets", preliminary lecture notes that are available at http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/∼longo/Lecture-Notes.html .

[19] R. Longo, Real Hilbert subspaces, modular theory, $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ and CFT, in: "Von Neumann algebras in Sibiu", pp. 33–91, *Theta Ser. Adv. Math.*, **10**, Theta, Bucharest (2008).

[20] R. Longo, V. Morinelli, K. -H. Rehren, Where Infinite Spin Particles Are Localizable, *Comm. in Math. Phys.* (2015).

[21] R. Longo, E. Witten, An algebraic construction of boundary Quantum Field Theory, *Comm. in Math. Phys.* 303 (2011) , 213-232.

[22] J.Mund, The Bisognano-Wichmann theorem for massive theories, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **2** (2001), 907-926.

[23] V.Morinelli, An algebraic condition for the Bisognano-Wichmann Property, *Proceedings of the 14th Marcel Grossmann Meeting - MG14* , Rome, (2015), arXiv:1604.04750, (to appear).

[24] M. A. Rieffel, A. Van Daele, *A bounded operator approach to Tomita-Takesaki theory*, Pacific J. Math. **69** (1977), 187–221.

[25] W. Ruhl, *The Lorentz group and harmonic analysis*, W. A. Benjamin Inc., New York (1970).

[26] B. Schroer, and H.-W. Wiesbrock, Modular theory and geometry, *Rev. Math. Phys.* 12, (2000), **1**, 139–158.

[27] J. Yngvason, *A note on essential duality*, Lett. Math. Phys., **31**, (1994), **2**, 127–141